

**Remarks**

The claims have been amended to cancel without prejudice the non-elected subject matter and for further clarity and consistency, thereby overcoming the Section 112 rejections of record.

Applicants traverse the rejections of the present claims for obviousness and contend that the Examiner has engaged in an impressible hindsight reconstruction of the prior art. Moreover, the Examiner has not demonstrated the requisite motivation or reasonable expectation of success for the present invention and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner's two main references are US Patent Nos. 5,753,228 or 4,357,272. The '228 patent used sonicated *C. parvum* oocytes to immunize hens for recovering antibodies in their egg yolk. The *C. parvum* is protozoa parasite, which would invoke an immune reaction by the presence of its large peptides such as enzymes or surface molecules. The '272 patent also discussed immunizing hens with peptide molecules such as those from viruses (Examples 2 and 3), human IgG (Example 4), human IgM (Example 5), tetanus (Example 6), snake venom (Examples 7 and 8) cancer antigens (Example 9), serameba antigen (example 10) and haemocyanin antigens of *Burnupena cincta*. All of these examples are related to peptides, not small organic molecules. The results of these examples cannot be properly extrapolated to small molecule organic pesticides. Therefore, none of the examples of these references would provide one of skill in art with a reasonable expectation of success of the present invention. Moreover, none of these references would provide one with motivation to conjugate a protein to a small molecule prior to administration.

The two secondary references, US Patent No. 5,688,682 and the Beasley article do not remedy the deficiencies of the two main references discussed above. The '682 patent relates to the production of bacterial vaccines against *Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae*. The vaccines are prepared by using sonicated whole cells. Vaccine preparation and antibody harvesting are two distinct fields of non-analogous art. One of skill in the art would not read the '682 patent and be motivated to arrive at the present invention nor have a reasonable expectation of success. The Beasley article relates to an antigen that is conjugated to ovalbumin and key hole limpet

haemocyanin for raising antibodies for an immunoassay. This reference alone or in any combination with the other cited references would not provide proper motivation or a reasonable expectation of success for the present invention.

The McAdam article does not cure the deficiencies of the other cited references. McAdam is merely related to the chemical coupling of the organophosphorous pesticide fenitrothion. Deignan is a comparative analysis of methods of purification of egg yolk immunoglobulin, and Akita relates to purification of egg yolk from hens immunized with an enterotoxigenic *E. coli* strain. Hatta merely relates to a method of isolation of hen egg yolk antibodies and provides no suggestion of the present invention in any combination with the other aforementioned references. Neither McAdam, Deignan, Akita nor Hatta would motivate one of skill in the art to arrive at the present invention, which relates to the production of egg yolk antibodies binding to small molecule organo chlorine pesticides. Moreover McAdam, Deignan, Akita and Hatta would not provide one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of success of the present invention.

Applicants urge that one of skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the references cited by the Examiner. Nor would the skilled artisan have a reasonable expectation of success of the present invention. Therefore, applicants submit the obviousness rejections of record are improper and respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

**IDS**

Applicants filed an IDS on January 28, 2003 of 12 references and request that an initialed copy of the Form SB/08 be returned by the Examiner with the next Office Action. If the IDS or any references are missing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned so that applicants may re-submit these references before the next Office Action issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 4, 2003  
FOLEY & LARDNER  
Washington Harbour  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20007-5109  
Telephone: (202) 672-5300  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

Matthew E. Mulkeen  
Registration No. 44,250

**Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.**